

**Remarks**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-identified application. Claims 1-36 remain in this application. Claims 2, 4-14, 16-20 and 25-36 have been amended. Support for the amendment of claim 2 may be found, for example, at page 4, lines 3-6; page 5, lines 3-5; and Figures 1-2.

**I. Claim Objection**

Claims 5-22 and 26-36 have been amended to overcome the claim objections for improper multiple dependency.

**II. Rejections based on art.**

Claims 1-4 and 23-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious in view of U.S. Patent 5,137,154 to Cohen combined with U.S. Patent 5,272,856 to Pharo. Applicants respectfully traverse.

As the previous Office action correctly points out, “Cohen fails to disclose the frame circumscribing the chamber portion,” as recited in independent claims 1 and 23. (Office action mailed Jan. 11, 2008 at page 4.)

To supplement this shortcoming, the Office action provides Pharo.

Pharo teaches an inflatable protective packaging device having top chamber 22 and bottom chamber 22a defining pocket 24 therebetween for retaining article A. (Column 3, lines 57-65; Figure 2, reproduced below.) Upon inflation, the top and bottom chambers “compress and conform” to the contours of the article within pocket 24 to cause “substantial encapsulation of the article A.” (Column 7, lines 18-20 and 26-30.)